

## REMARKS

Claims 13 through 37 are in the application, with claims 13, 22, and 31 having been amended. Claims 13, 22, and 31 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and entry of this amendment are respectfully requested.

### Objection to the Drawings

FIG. 18 has been amended in response to the objection to the drawings. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections

Claims 13, 15-22, and 24-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,307,573, (“Barros”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,735,593 (“Williams”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Amended independent Claim 13 relates to presentation of a plurality of selectable corporate entities and a plurality of selectable elements. A first one of the plurality of corporate entities is at least a partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream from the second one of the plurality of entities. A third one of the plurality of corporate entities is at least partial owned by a fourth one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the fourth one of the plurality of entities. A selection of the second corporate entity is received, and a selection of one of the plurality of selectable elements is received. Information corresponding to the one selected element and relating to the selected second corporate entity is then determined, and the determined information is presented to a user. Moreover, each of the plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of amended independent Claim 1. Specifically, the art of record is not seen to disclose or suggest (1) a first one of a plurality of corporate entities that is at least a partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream from the

second one of the plurality of entities, and (2) a third one of the plurality of corporate entities that is at least partial owned by a fourth one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the fourth one of the plurality of entities.

The Office Action states that Barros, at column 17, lines 1-8, allegedly teaches that a “first one of the plurality of entities is organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from a second of the plurality of entities.” Furthermore, Barros, at the aforementioned section, describes a map area that displays sets of map symbols. When a symbol is clicked on, a pop-up will appear to provide annotation material associated with the symbol. The material may be presented on multiple cards or may be provided in a area referred to as a belowbar. However, nowhere does Barros disclose that the annotation material provided on multiple cards or in the belowbar indicates whether a corporate entity is a partial owner of another corporate entity or is partially owned by another corporate entity.

Williams discloses a database architecture that comprises entity subtypes and supertypes. At column 21, lines 7 through 18, Williams discloses that abstract supertypes may group heterogeneous things for a special purpose. For example, a supertype may define contractual parties such as both corporate entities and individuals. However, nowhere does Williams disclose or suggest that a first one of a plurality of corporate entities is at least a partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream from the second one of the plurality of entities. Furthermore, Williams fails to disclose or to suggest a third one of the plurality of corporate entities that is at least partial owned by a fourth one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the fourth one of the plurality of entities.

Therefore, nowhere can the combination of Barros and Williams, taken in any permissible combination, be seen to disclose or to suggest (1) a first one of a plurality of corporate entities that is at least a partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream from the second one of the plurality of entities, and (2) a third one of the plurality of corporate entities that is at least partial owned by a

fourth one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the fourth one of the plurality of entities.

Amended independent Claim 13 and its related dependent claims are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent Claims 22 and 31 relate to a computer-readable medium and an apparatus and include features roughly corresponding to those discussed above with respect to Claim 13. For at least the foregoing reasons, amended independent Claims 22 and 31 and their respective dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

## CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding each of the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed herein because they are not related to the rejections of the independent claims. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2008  
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/  
Richard S. Finkelstein  
Registration No. 56,534  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
50 Locust Avenue  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-0049

Attachment: FIG 18 – Replacement Sheet